

REMARKS

In a telephone conversation between Examiner and Applicant on **5 March 2008**, Examiner raised the issue of potential rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for claims 34-37 as failing to meet the enablement requirement.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Examiner states that Claims 34-37 face potential rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as failing to meet the enablement requirement. More specifically, examiner avers that the “data structure” recited in claim 34 is not clearly disclosed in the specification and therefore the claims 34-37 fail to meet the enablement requirement. Accordingly, Applicant has amended claim 34 to replace the limitation “data structure” with “memory structure.” These amendments find support in page 13, ll. 16-22 and FIG. 2 of the instant application. No new matter has been added.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 13, 16, 29, and 38 as previously presented, and claim 34 as currently amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that the dependent claims that depend upon the independent claims are for the same reasons in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the application is presently in form for allowance.
Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Anthony Jones/
Anthony Jones
Registration No. 59,521

Date: 12 March 2008

Anthony Jones
Park, Vaughan & Fleming LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1666
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: tony@parklegal.com